

*Subsidies given by the State*

Annually certain provision are made in the Budget to meet Administration and Contingency expenditure of the Mysore Housing Board.

*Low Income Group Housing Scheme*

This Scheme is implemented by the Housing Board, M.S.H.C. and Local Bodies. The Housing Board draws the amounts and makes payment to these Bodies. Individuals are also granted for construction of houses according to availability of funds.

*Middle Income Group Housing*

Loans are being secured through Government of India from the Insurance Corporation of India and distributed for the implementation of the scheme by the Mysore Housing Board, Mysore State Housing Corporation and the Local Bodies. These institutions will either construct houses or sanction individual loans.

**Gorur Project across Hemavathi River.**

Q.—35. Sri V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they have investigated the feasibility of Gorur Project across Hemavathi river;

(b) whether the said Project was investigated in the year 1935-36 or thereafter;

(c) if so, the details of the Project such as (i) cost of the Project, (ii) the height of the dam, (iii) the storage capacity, (iv) the extent of submersion and irrigable area, and (v) the amount of compensation proposed to be paid;

(d) whether they intend to undertake the Gorur Project during the Third Plan period;

(e) if so, whether there would be any revision of the design, etc. [the details as mentioned in (c) above may be furnished]?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) (i) Rs. 182.3 lakhs. (ii) 118 ft. (iii) 19.25 T.M. Cft. (iv) (a) extent of submersion—15,726 acres with 31 villages. (b) Irrigable area—48,500 acres. (v) Rs. 107.17 lakhs.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes. The details are given below:

	1st Stage.	2nd Stage.
(i) Cost of the Project	Rs. 390 lakhs	124 lakhs.
(ii) Height of Dam	83 ft.	88 ft.
(iii) Storage	7.27 T.M.Cft.	11.2 T.M.Cft.
(iv) (a) Extent of submersion	7973 Acres	10,440 Acres Total.
(b) Extent of Irrigation	33,000 Acres	16,000 Acres Total.
(22,000 Acres New, (Additional).		
(v) Compensation	Rs. 40.03 lakhs.	Rs. 48.57 lakhs.

**Liquidation of Illiteracy in the State.**

Q.—36. Sri T. MADAI AH GOWDA (Ramanagaram).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they have any plan to liquidate illiteracy in the State in any definite period and if so the details may be placed on the Table?

(b) whether they have allotted any amount for this purpose;

(c) that the percentage of illiterate adults that are made literate every year for the last five years?

A.—Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—

(a) No.

(b) No.

(c) Information not available.

**Enhancement of D. A. by the Central Government to their Employees.**

Q.—45. Sri S. RAJAGOPAL (Kolar Gold Fields).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they are aware of the

(SRI S. RAJAGOPAL)

recent enhancement of D. A. by the Central Government to their employees;

(b) whether they are aware that this would increase the disparity in emoluments between the Government of India employees and those of the State Government and consequently lead to discontent among the State Government employees;

(c) whether they propose to revise the D.A. of the State Government employees;

(d) the difference in Scales of Pay, Allowances, etc., between employees under the Government of India and that of State Government (differences amongst Class III and IV Class employees may be given)?

A.—SRI B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—

(a) Yes, Government are aware.

(b) Yes, it will create certain amount of disparity in the emoluments between Central Government and State Government employees. That need not lead to discontent among the State Government employees as their scales have necessarily to be regulated with reference to the State's resources and other local conditions.

(c) The Government have not yet considered the question in view of the present financial position.

(d) It is very difficult to draw a comparison, as posts in Central and State Governments differ. In the case of peons and I Division and II Division Clerks only, some comparison is possible and the same is noted below:—

Centre	State
I Division 130-280	130-270 (Sectt).
II Division 110-180	80-150
Peons 70-85	50-60

The alleged disparity in emoluments between Central Government and State Government employees is not peculiar to this State. It exists in other States also like Madras, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh etc.

The last Central Pay Commission devoted considerable time to the question of disparity. The following extracts from their Report would show

how difficult this question is (Extracts appended).

For the reasons mentioned therein the question of disparity could only be dealt with gradually, to the extent practicable with due regard to the several circumstances mentioned above and mainly with reference to financial resources of the State.

The following extracts from the Last Central Pay Commission :

\* \* \*

"The emoluments of the employees of the State Governments seem to have a fair degree of relation with the revenues of the State".

"It does seem to us that with some exception the disparities in emoluments of public servants in different States are to a large extent, but not entirely, the reflection of unequal levels of economic development and of differences in the financial resources of the State Governments".

"Even assuming that all the State Governments have in relation to their population, etc., equal financial resources, and that there is perfect distribution of revenues between the Centre and the State, it does not follow that there would be uniformity in emoluments paid by the State Governments to their employees or parity between those and the Central Government. One State Government may consider extension of education or health services to be far more important than improving the remuneration of its employees; another may consider prohibition of intoxicating drinks notwithstanding the loss of revenue that it may involve a matter of greater urgency; and a third may give preference to increase the salaries of its employees. Not all the Governments in the country may accept identical principles for determination of salaries and wages or may apply even common principles in

the same way. Determination of the remuneration and conditions of service of the Central and State Government employees on an identical basis is not feasible, unless it is decided to have a unitary form of Government in the whole country. It seems to us that in the face of context of constitutional structure, the issue of disparities is a highly complexed one entangled with great delicacies. It is not the one that could be solved in a simple way".

\* \* \*

### Procedure adopted for leasing out Government Buildings to private parties.

Q.—49. Sri C. M. REVANA SIDDIAIAH (Siruguppa).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether there is an old Records building in Koppal in Raichur District;

(b) if so, in whose custody it is with now;

(c) whether the Municipality of Koppal has requested the Government to give the said building for running a school;

(d) why was it not given to the Municipality;

(e) whether any portion of the building was given to a private party and if so on what condition and authority;

(f) the procedure adopted while leasing out the building and why private party was preferred as against a public local body?

A.—Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—

(a) Yes.

(b) A portion of the building is in custody of the Education Department and another portion is with one Sri N. Kotarappa, Proprietor, Arvind Press, Koppal.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise in view of reply to clause (c) above.

(e) Yes. Under the orders of the Executive Engineer, Raichur

(f) This is under investigation.

### Construction of a Bridge across Hirehalla between Ron and Hole Alur.

Q.—51. Sri A. J. DODDAMETI (Ron).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they are aware that the work regarding the construction of a bridge across Hirehalla between Ron and Hole Alur, Ron Taluka, Dharwar District, has been sanctioned and taken up;

(b) if so, the date on which the contract was given for the above work;

(c) the date on which the contractor commenced the construction of the bridge and the stage at which the work is now pending and the particulars of its progress;

(d) whether they are aware that there is inordinate delay in the construction of the bridge;

(e) if so, the steps taken by them to avoid such delay;

(f) whether difference of opinion between the P.W.D. and the contractor is one of the reasons for the inordinate delay;

(g) if so, the particulars thereof;

(h) the steps taken by them to remove such differences?

A.—Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—

(a) Yes.

(b) 25th February 1959.

(c) The contractor commenced the work on 10-12-1959. Three piers are constructed upto bed level and one abutment with returns constructed upto road level and further work is at standstill now.

(d) Yes.

(e) The contractor has been several times served with notices to expedite the work. The last one issued is on 8-1-1962. In spite of this, the contractor has not re-started the work as yet. Further steps are being taken.